Subj: **Boxley-turner Memorandum**
Date: 4/5/00 4:24:13 PM Eastern Daylight Time
From: vsalandria@phila.k12.pa.us (Vincent J. Salandria)
To: rcdean@juno.com, sharrech@shu.edu, 71510.235@compuserve.com, garyag@ix.netcom.com, Joanmellen@aol.com, jkelin@rmi.net (John Kelin), osanic@astridmm.com, martin-and-sy@mediaone.net, morrissey@01019freenet.de, sgjones@ptd.net, robertjyoung@earthlink.net, TKeske@mediaone.net, ezekielk@iname.com

Dear Mike,

The Boxley-Turner memorandum set forth a number of persons, including Nancy Perrin Rich and her husband, Robert Perrin, who were allegedly involved in the conspiracy to kill Kennedy. It was not a simple memorandum dropped into the lap of Garrison. Rather it had involved extensive investigation by Boxley and Turner. It was a symphony to be played by Garrison which was designed to culminate his assssination work with a crescendo of arrests of innocent people.

I was called by Harold Weisberg. He advisesd me that Garrison was prepared to charge several people criminally and to make several arrests based on a memorandum. Harold asked me to accompany him to New Orleans. He told me that Garrison would hold up making the charges and arrests pending our perusal of the memorandum.

Because Harold Weisberg was hurting financially, I paid his fare to New Orleans. Bernard Fensterwald went along with us.

In New Orleans Garrison gave us the memorandum. I read it in a hurry and saw immediately that it was a blizzard of lies. Weisberg spent the day and worked into the throgh the night into the morning writing a counter memorandum demonstrating why it was completely false. Fensterwald took a passive role, but it was abundantly clear that he too held the opinon that the memorandum was just a mound of ill-smelling stuff.

When we explained to Garrison why the memorandum had to be a trap for him and had no validity, he immediately agreed. He stated that we would fire Boxley. He did so immediately.

I was convinced that Turner, as the memorandum's coauthor, was equally guilty of seeking to destroy Jim Garrison. But I recognized that Jim had grown to love Turner, so I did not push on Garrison that Turner had to be connected with Boxley in a scheme to bring down Garrison. I realized that Turner had to be in full cooperation with Boxley in order to have worked with him and to have lent his investigative expertise to the production of such an obviously false memorandum. Of course, Boxley and Turner had prepared this memorandum without having shared it with the rest of Garrison's staff.

Later, when I learned that Turner was coming to Philadelphia for a radio program, I contacted him and asked him to come to my home. I told him that the visit was important, because I intended to show him why he had to be a government agent. To my request I received no reply. He came to Philadelphia and made no effort to see me.

I figured that Garrison's office had been thoroughly infiltrated by the government. I concluded that Turner, as one of the several agents, could in the future do damage. But I also figured that the infiltration was so thorough that damage was inevitable with or without Turner's

efforts. I realized that the relationship between Turner and Garrison was a close one. Garrison had been traumatized by the revelation of Boxley as an agent. He had been most fond of Boxley. I therefore, did not push at Garrison my feelings about Turner.

I am convinced that the Boxley-Turner memorandum was patently fraudulent. The memorandum had never been shared with other members of Garrison's staff. I submit that Boxley and Turner knew that if other Garrison staff members had been afforded an opporunity to read that memorandum, that it could not have withstood scrutiny. Once we exposed it as a pack of lies, neither Boxley nor Turner ever sought to defend it. It is quite simply indefensible. Nor can it be explained away as just poor but honestly intended investigative work. The obvious falsity of its material demonstrates beyond a question that it was a premeditated trap designed to finish off Jim Garrison as a viable public figure.

Those of you who are in good standing with Harold Weisberg can ask him to provide you with a copy of that memorandum along with his written refutation of it. Jim Douglass can do this. If you are interested, ask Jim to request at my expense a copy from Harold Weisberg.

I am confident that Joan Mellen has a copy of the memorandum. She can help settle in your mind and in the minds of the other members of the group whether she is correct in her belief which she expressed to me that Turner was and continues to be loyal to Jim Garrison. Here is her opportunity to offer evidence that I am in fact irrational in my conviction that Turner was a government agent infilitrating Garrison's office to undermine his work.

Love,

Vince

——————— Headers ———————
Return-Path: <vsalandria@phila.k12.pa.us>
Received: from rly-zb05.mx.aol.com (rly-zb05.mail.aol.com [172.31.41.5]) by air-zb05.mail.aol.com (v70.20) with ESMTP; Wed, 05 Apr 2000 16:24:13 -0400
Received: from mail.phila.k12.pa.us (mail.phila.k12.pa.us [170.235.1.4]) by rly-zb05.mx.aol.com (v71.10) with ESMTP; Wed, 05 Apr 2000 16:23:59 -0400
Received: from hr (ip243-185.admin-arch.phila.k12.pa.us [170.235.243.185])
by mail.phila.k12.pa.us (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id QAA28262;
Wed, 5 Apr 2000 16:22:09 -0400 (EDT)
Message-Id: <3.0.6.32.20000405153403.007a3e70@mail.phila.k12.pa.us>
X-Sender: vsalandria@mail.phila.k12.pa.us
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.6 (32)
Date: Wed, 05 Apr 2000 15:34:03 -0700
To: rcdean@juno.com, sharrech@shu.edu, 71510.235@compuserve.com,
garyag@ix.netcom.com, Joanmellen@aol.com, jkelin@rmi.net (John Kelin),
osanic@astridmm.com, martin-and-sy@mediaone.net,
morrissey@01019freenet.de, sgjones@ptd.net, robertjyoung@earthlink.net,
TKeske@mediaone.net, ezekielk@iname.com
From: "Vincent J. Salandria" <vsalandria@phila.k12.pa.us>
Subject: Boxley-turner Memorandum
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"